



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/824,196 | 04/14/2004 | T. Douglas Mast | END5312USNP | 5885 |
| 27805 | 7590 | 09/09/2008 | | |
| THOMPSON HINE L.L.P. Intellectual Property Group P.O. BOX 8801 DAYTON, OH 45401-8801 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| JOHNSON III, HENRY M | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3739 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 09/09/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,196

Applicant(s)

MAST ET AL.

Examiner

Henry M. Johnson, III

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/55/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :04/25/08
05/28/08 08/26/08 08/27/08.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 25, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. All previous rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,413,550 to Castel in view of Watkin et al., Hill et al. and Billard et al. (all Non-patent literature).

Castel discloses an ultrasound medical treatment system comprising: a) an ultrasound medical-treatment transducer (unit 2 and element 15); and b) a controller (4) which powers the transducer to deliver ultrasound at an ultrasound acoustic power for or beyond a determined treatment time to thermally ablate patient tissue (column 7 line 66- column 8 line 3), and at or above a determined ultrasound acoustic power for a treatment time to thermally ablate patient tissue (column 9 lines 47-48), wherein the controller determines the treatment time from a function (column 9 lines 29-45). Castel does not disclose determining an in vivo treatment time (or ultrasound acoustic power) from a function of experimentally determined in vitro treatment time (or ultrasound acoustic power) for the transducer to deliver ultrasound at the ultrasound acoustic power (or for the treatment time) for the in vitro treatment time (or at the in vitro ultrasound acoustic power) to thermally ablate patient tissue in vitro. Castel also does not disclose that the mathematical function includes blood perfusion rate and patient tissue density. Watkin teaches conducting studies on in vitro samples to define suitable exposure parameters for a high intensity focused ultrasound procedure in vivo (abstract). Watkin teaches that a threshold exposure time was determined in vitro (page 193, "In Vitro Tissue Model"), and then the in vivo focal peak intensity was calculated in order to account for the acoustic loss in vivo (page 193, column 2, second full paragraph). Watkin further teaches that for exposure times of greater than approximately 3 seconds, blood perfusion rate and patient tissue density are critical for determining in vivo exposure parameters from in vitro exposure parameters (Discussion, pages 194 and 195). Hill teaches theoretical models of the formation of ultrasonic focal lesions in tissue. The theoretical models include equations with the following variables/terms: time,

patient tissue density, blood perfusion rate, temperature, and ultrasonic power deposition rate (page 260). Billard et al. disclose research to determine the effects of blood perfusion rates and tissue properties on ultrasonic pulses to obtain predictable thermal dosages. Billard et al. teach that for short treatment pulses or times, the blood perfusion rate has little impact on the dosages. This clearly teaches that above two second pulse lengths, the blood perfusion rate is significant and a skilled artisan would be motivated to include such in any algorithms for control of the ultrasonic device. The examiner takes the position that the combined teachings of Watkin et al., Hill et al. and Billard et al. provide teachings that a skilled artisan could not ignore in providing models for ultrasonic ablation to in vivo tissue. The prior work in correlating in vitro to in vivo ablation and the effects of both blood perfusion rates and tissue properties would be well known to one of skill in the art. It is also noted that the migration of an experimental laboratory procedure to a practical in vivo procedure is the cornerstone for most medical advances. Castel merely provides a platform or structure for the implementation of the calculated treatments. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use a mathematical formula including blood perfusion rate and tissue density as taught by Watkin/Hill/Billard in the invention of Castel to provide in vivo ultrasonic ablation as derived from in vitro experiments, as it is pervasive in the arts that in vitro procedures evolve to produce in vitro procedures based of the type of research as exemplified by Watkin/Hill/Billard.

Regarding claims 11 and 13, the times are related to intended use with no impact on the device structure.

Regarding claims 12 and 14, 55 seconds is clearly well above the times of two and three seconds as taught by the prior art as being insignificant for blood perfusion and tissue density and therefore a skilled artisan must include such variable in any treatment above three seconds.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry M. Johnson, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-4768. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 5:30 AM to 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Henry M. Johnson, III/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3739

/HMJ/
9/3/2008